arXiv:hep-ph/0612041v1 5 Dec 2006

Seesaw mechanism and leptogenesis *

D. Falcone

Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche, Università di Napoli, Via Cintia, Napoli, Italy

A brief overview of the phenomenology related to the seesaw mechanism and the baryogenesis via leptogenesis is presented. In particular, it is explained how large but not maximal lepton mixing can be achieved within the type II seesaw mechanism. Moreover, the consequences for leptogenesis are explored, including flavor effects.

* Based on the talk presented at the Laboratoire de Physique Theorique, Université de Paris-Sud 11, Orsay Cedex, France (November 21, 2006).

A breakthrough in particle physics occurred in year 1998, when the SuperKamiokande Collaboration announced evidence for oscillation of atmospheric neutrinos ν_μ [1]. Then, in 2002, at the Sudbury Neutrino Observatory, evidence for oscillation of solar neutrinos ν_e has been also found [2]. These two important results come after a long series of experiments, back to the atmospheric neutrino anomaly [3] and the solar neutrino problem [4]. The fully terrestrial experiments K2K and KamLAND confirm the above results for ν_μ and ν_e, respectively [5].

The most natural explanation of neutrino oscillations [6] is that neutrinos have masses and leptons mix just (almost) like quarks do. In this case, neutrino mass eigenstates ν_i are related to neutrino flavor eigenstates ν_α by the unitary transformation $\nu_\alpha = U_{\alpha i}\nu_i$, where U is the lepton mixing matrix [7].

Oscillation experiments provide square mass differences and mixing angles. One has

$$m_3^2 - m_2^2 = \Delta m^2_{atm} \simeq (0.05 \text{ eV})^2 \tag{1}$$

$$m_2^2 - m_1^2 = \Delta m^2_{sol} \simeq (0.009 \text{ eV})^2 \tag{2}$$

and the mixing matrix is given by

$$U \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{\sqrt{6}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & \epsilon \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3}$$

with $\epsilon < 0.2$, where $U_{e2} \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$ is related to solar oscillations and $U_{\mu 3} \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ to atmospheric oscillations.

Moreover, from cosmology (Large Scale Structure and Cosmic Microwave Background) we get

$$\sum m_i \lesssim 0.7 \text{ eV}, \tag{4}$$

from the endpoint of tritium beta decay

$$U_{ei}^2 m_i^2 \lesssim (2 \text{ eV})^2, \tag{5}$$

and from the neutrinoless double beta decay

$$U_{ei}^2 m_i \lesssim 1 \text{ eV}. \tag{6}$$

Since $m_3^2 - m_2^2 \gg m_2^2 - m_1^2$, even if the hierarchy is not so strong, we have three main spectra for the effective neutrinos [8], namely the normal

$$m_1 < m_2 \ll m_3, \tag{7}$$

the inverse

$$m_1 \simeq m_2 \gg m_3, \tag{8}$$

and the quasi-degenerate

$$m_1 \simeq m_2 \simeq m_3. \tag{9}$$

From the summary of experimental informations we note that the neutrino mass is very small with respect to quarks and charged leptons. Moreover, about the three independent mixings, $U_{\mu 3}$, U_{e2}, and U_{e3}, we have $U_{\mu 3}$ maximal, U_{e2} large but not maximal, and U_{e3} small. This is in contrast to the quark sector, where the three independent mixings are small or very small [9].

Both features, small neutrino masses and large lepton mixings, can be accounted for by the seesaw mechanism [10]. It requires only a modest extension of the minimal standard model, namely the addition of a heavy fermionic singlet, the right-handed neutrino ν_R. In fact, this state allows to create a Dirac mass M_D for the neutrino, which is related to the electroweak symmetry breaking and thus expected to be of the same order of quark or charged lepton masses. Moreover, it allows also a Majorana mass M_R for the right-handed neutrino, which is not related to electroweak breaking (but breaks lepton number) and thus can be very large. Then the effective neutrino mass matrix is given by

$$M_\nu \simeq M_D M_R^{-1} M_D = v^2 Y_D M_R^{-1} Y_D, \tag{10}$$

where v is the v.e.v. of the standard Higgs field (electroweak breaking scale), and Y_D is the Yukawa coupling matrix. This seesaw mechanism is called type I and of course gives small M_ν, since M_D is suppressed by $M_D M_R^{-1}$.

There is also a triplet seesaw mechanism [11], which requires a heavy scalar triplet T. In this case

$$M_\nu = M_L = Y_L v_L, \tag{11}$$

where v_L is an induced v.e.v.,

$$v_L = \gamma \frac{v^2}{m_T}. \tag{12}$$

The sum of the two terms gives the type II seesaw formula [12]

$$M_\nu \simeq M_D M_R^{-1} M_D + M_L. \tag{13}$$

Note that in the type I term there is a double matrix product, which can generate large mixings from small mixings in Y_D and also in M_R [13]. Instead, in the type II (triplet) term, there is only one matrix, so that large mixing is present or not, by hand.
Then we consider the type I term as fundamental and the triplet term as a kind of pertubation.

Let us describe the effect on the mixing in the type II seesaw mechanism [14], using a model for mass matrices [15], based on broken $U(2)$ horizontal symmetry and simple quark-lepton symmetry $M_e \sim M_d$, $M_D \sim M_u$,

$$M_D \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^{12} & \lambda^6 & \lambda^{10} \\ \lambda^6 & \lambda^4 & \lambda^4 \\ \lambda^{10} & \lambda^4 & 1 \end{pmatrix} m_t, \tag{14}$$

$$M_e \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^6 & \lambda^3 & \lambda^5 \\ \lambda^3 & \lambda^2 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^5 & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} m_b, \tag{15}$$

$$M_R \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^{12} & \lambda^{10} & \lambda^6 \\ \lambda^{10} & \lambda^8 & \lambda^4 \\ \lambda^6 & \lambda^4 & 1 \end{pmatrix} m_R, \tag{16}$$

with $\lambda = 0.2$. Notice that the scale $m_R = M_3 \sim 10^{16}$, $M_2 \sim 10^{10}$, $M_1 \sim 10^7$ GeV. One could also adopt different mass matrices, keeping the analysis and possibly the results quite similar. The type I seesaw mechanism gives

$$M_\nu^I \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \frac{m_t^2}{m_R}, \tag{17}$$

corresponding to a normal hierarchy. Moreover we assume that the triplet term is

$$M_\nu^{II} = M_L = \frac{m_L}{m_R} M_R. \tag{18}$$

This form can be motivated within left-right and $SO(10)$ models. However, in the mood of Ref.[15] we can think it to be generated by coupling M_L to the same flavon fields as M_R.

Now, since we do not write coefficients in mass matrices, consider the following form of matrix (17),

$$M_\nu^I \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^2 & 1+\frac{\lambda^n}{2} & 1-\frac{\lambda^n}{2} \\ \lambda^2 & 1-\frac{\lambda^n}{2} & 1+\frac{\lambda^n}{2} \end{pmatrix} \frac{m_t^2}{m_R}, \tag{19}$$

with $n = 1, 2, 3, 4$, which gives maximal $U_{\mu 3}$ but different U_{e2}, according to the value of n. In fact, for $n = 4$ one has $\sin\theta_{12} = 1/\sqrt{2}$ and $\epsilon = 0$, that is the bimaximal mixing. For $n = 3, 2, 1$ we get $\sin\theta_{12} \simeq 0.68; 0.58; 0.25$; respectively.

The contribution from M_ν^{II} will we parametrized by the ratio

$$k = \frac{m_\nu^{II}}{m_\nu^I} = \frac{m_L m_R}{v^2} = \gamma\, \frac{m_R}{m_T} \tag{20}$$

and leads to decrease the mixing 2-3 and especially 1-2 [16].

We consider numerical results, but first the contribution from M_e should be taken into account. It is similar to the CKM matrix in the Wolfenstein form and gives

$$\sin\theta_{e2} \simeq \sin\theta_{12} - \frac{\lambda}{2}, \tag{21}$$

$$\sin\theta_{\mu 3} \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(1-\lambda^2\right), \tag{22}$$

$$\sin\theta_{e3} \simeq -\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{2}}. \tag{23}$$

However, we should also study the Georgi-Jarlskog (GJ) option [17], which yields better values for the fermion masses

$$M_e \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^6 & \lambda^3 & \lambda^5 \\ \lambda^3 & -3\lambda^2 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^5 & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} m_b. \tag{24}$$

In this case we get

$$\sin\theta_{e2} \simeq \sin\theta_{12}^\nu + \frac{\lambda}{6}, \tag{25}$$

$$\sin\theta_{23} \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(1-\lambda^2\right),$$
$$\sin\theta_{13} \simeq \frac{\lambda}{3\sqrt{2}}. \tag{26}$$

Finally we sum M_ν^{II} to M_ν^I and combine with the mixing coming from M_e, and look for agreement with experimental ranges of mixings.

We find the following results:

Case $n = 4$ requires $0 \leq k < 0.05$, or $0.08 < k < 0.18$ for the GJ option.

Case $n = 3$ requires $0 \leq k < 0.04$, or $0.06 < k < 0.16$ for the GJ option.

Case $n = 2$ is reliable only for the GJ choice with $0 \leq k < 0.10$.

Case $n = 1$ is not reliable at all.

Note that the presence of zero means that the triplet term can be absent. It is instead necessary for $n = 4, 3$ in the GJ option.

In particular, the difference between the observed quark-lepton complementarity and the theoretical prediction based on realistic (GJ) quark-lepton symmetry in cases $n = 4, 3$ could be ascribed to the triplet contribution within the type II seesaw mechanism [18]. We predict

$$\theta_{e3} \simeq \lambda/3\sqrt{2} \simeq 0.05, \tag{27}$$

which can be checked in future experiments.

Now we consider a cosmological consequence of the seesaw mechanism, namely the baryogenesis via leptogenesis [19, 20]. It aims to reproduce the baryon asymmetry

$$\eta_B = \frac{n_B}{n_\gamma} = (6.1 \pm 0.2) \cdot 10^{-10} \tag{28}$$

by means of the out-of-equilibrium decays of the right-handed neutrinos which generate a lepton asymmetry partially converted to baryon asymmetry by electroweak sphaleron processes [21].

The main formulas are

$$y_B \simeq \frac{1}{7}\eta_B \simeq \frac{1}{2} y_L \tag{29}$$

where

$$y_L \simeq 0.3 \, \frac{\epsilon_1}{g_*} \left(\frac{0.55 \cdot 10^{-3} eV}{\tilde{m}_1} \right)^{1.16} \tag{30}$$

in the strong washout regime, or

$$y_L \simeq 0.3 \, \frac{\epsilon_1}{g_*} \left(\frac{\tilde{m}_1}{3.3 \cdot 10^{-3} eV} \right) \tag{31}$$

in the weak washout regime, $g_* \simeq 100$,

$$\tilde{m}_1 = \frac{(Y_D^\dagger Y_D)_{11} v^2}{M_1} \tag{32}$$

and

$$\epsilon_1 \simeq \frac{3}{16\pi} \frac{(Y_D^\dagger Y_D)_{12}^2}{(Y_D^\dagger Y_D)_{11}} \frac{M_1}{M_2} \tag{33}$$

is a CP asymmetry related to the decay of the lightest right-handed neutrino in the basis where both M_e and M_R are diagonal.

We have

$$Y_D \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^7 & \lambda^5 & \lambda^5 \\ \lambda^6 & \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^6 & \lambda^4 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \; Y_D^\dagger Y_D \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^{12} & \lambda^{10} & \lambda^6 \\ \lambda^{10} & \lambda^8 & \lambda^4 \\ \lambda^6 & \lambda^4 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{34}$$

Then, for the Type I matrix model considered above we get

$$\epsilon_1 = \frac{3}{16\pi} \lambda^{12} = 2.4 \cdot 10^{-10} \tag{35}$$

and $\tilde{m}_1 \simeq m_1 \sim 10^{-4}$ eV, in the weak wash out regime, so that

$$y_B \sim 10^{-14} \tag{36}$$

well below the experimental value.

The contribution from triplet leptogenesis is related to M_1/m_T and k [22], and hence negligible in our context.

The formulas used above are valid in the so-called one flavor approximation. Let us consider also flavored leptogenesis [23]: the processes which wash out lepton number are flavor dependent (for example, the inverse decays from electrons can destroy the lepton asymmetry carried by electrons). Asymmetries in each flavor are washed out differently, and appear with different weights in the final formula [24]. Indeed a flavor index α is present:

$$y_{\alpha\alpha} \simeq 0.3 \, \frac{\epsilon_{\alpha\alpha}}{g_*} \left(\frac{0.55 \cdot 10^{-3} eV}{\tilde{m}_{\alpha\alpha}} \right)^{1.16} \tag{37}$$

in the strong washout regime,

$$y_{\alpha\alpha} \simeq 0.3 \, \frac{\epsilon_{\alpha\alpha}}{g_*} \left(\frac{\tilde{m}_1}{3.3 \cdot 10^{-3} eV} \right) \left(\frac{\tilde{m}_{\alpha\alpha}}{3.3 \cdot 10^{-3} eV} \right) \tag{38}$$

in the weak washout regime, with

$$\tilde{m}_{\alpha\alpha} = (Y_D^*)_{\alpha 1} (Y_D)_{\alpha 1} \frac{v^2}{M_1}, \tag{39}$$

$$\epsilon_{\alpha\alpha} \simeq \frac{3}{16\pi} \frac{(Y_D^*)_{\alpha 2} (Y_D^\dagger Y_D)_{12} (Y_D)_{\alpha 1}}{(Y_D^\dagger Y_D)_{11}} \frac{M_1}{M_2}. \tag{40}$$

Note that Y_D appears not only in the combination $(Y_D^\dagger Y_D)$ but also by alone. The final formula for the baryon asymmetry is [25]

$$y_B = \frac{12}{37} \left(\frac{40}{13} y_{ee} + \frac{51}{13} y_{\mu\mu} + \frac{51}{13} y_{\tau\tau} \right). \tag{41}$$

For the type I model considered above we get $y_{\tau\tau} \simeq y_{\mu\mu} \simeq y_L/2$ and y_{ee} negligible, with $\tilde{m}_{\tau\tau} \sim \tilde{m}_{\mu\mu} \sim \tilde{m}_1$ in the weak washout regime, so that y_B is enhanced only by a factor about 5.

We see that quark-lepton symmetry seems to imply an amount of baryon asymmetry which is too small by about three orders of magnitude [26, 27]. Indeed, M_1 is smaller than the Davidson-Ibarra bound, $M_1 > 10^9$ GeV [28]. There are some ways out of this problem. A trivial one is to consider a moderate hierarchy in M_D, for example $M_D \sim M_e(m_t/m_b)$, see

Ref.[29]. Another is to take nearly off-diagonal M_R as it appears by inverting the seesaw formula [30, 31]. In this case the overall mass scale is an intermediate scale instead of a unification scale.

Another different possibility is to take into account special flavor effects (allignement conditions) which preserve ϵ_2, contrary to usual assumptions [32]. Then for our model we get

$$\epsilon_2 \simeq \frac{3}{16\pi}\lambda^8 = 1.5 \cdot 10^{-7} \tag{42}$$

and $y_B \sim 10^{-11}$ in the right order of magnitude.

In conclusion, the (type II) seesaw mechanism is able to explain small neutrino masses and large or maximal lepton mixings. However, if one assumes quark-lepton symmetry, the amount of baryon asymmetry produced in the leptogenesis mechanism is too small, unless special flavor effects are realized, or M_R has a nearly off-diagonal form.

We thank Luis Oliver and Asmaa Abada in Orsay for kindly hospitality and discussions, and Franco Buccella in Naples for discussions and support.

[1] Y. Fukuda et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 81 (1998) 1562

[2] Q.R. Ahmad et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 89 (2002) 011301; 011302

[3] K.S. Hirata et al., Phys. Lett. B 205 (1988) 416

[4] R. Davis, D.S. Harmer and K.C. Hoffman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 20 (1968) 1205

[5] M.H. Ahn et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 90 (2003) 041801
K. Eguchi et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 90 (2003) 021802

[6] B. Pontecorvo, Sov. Phys. JETP 7 (1958) 172; 26 (1968) 984

[7] Z. Maki, M. Nakagawa and S. Sakata, Prog. Theor. Phys. 28 (1962) 870

[8] G. Altarelli, Phys. Rep. 320 (1999) 295

[9] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. 51 (1983) 1945

[10] P. Minkowski, Phys. Lett. B 67 (1977) 421
R.N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. 44 (1980) 912

[11] M. Magg and C. Wetterich, Phys. Lett. B 94 (1980) 61
T.P. Cheng and L.F. Li, Phys. Rev. D 22 (1980) 2860

[12] G. Lazarides, Q. Shafi and C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. B 181 (1981) 287
R.N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. D 23 (1981) 165

[13] A.Yu. Smirnov, Phys. Rev. D 48 (1993) 3264

[14] D. Falcone, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 21 (2006) 3015

[15] D. Falcone, Phys. Rev. D 64 (2001) 117302

[16] W. Rodejohann, Eur. Phys. J. C 32 (2004) 235

[17] H. Georgi and C. Jarlskog, Phys. Lett. B 86 (1979) 297

[18] D. Falcone, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 21 (2006) 1815

[19] M. Fukugita and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B 174 (1986) 45

[20] M. Luty, Phys. Rev. D 45 (1992) 455
L. Covi, E. Roulet and F. Vissani, Phys. Lett. B 384 (1996) 169
W. Buchmuller and M. Plumacher, Phys. Rep. 320 (1999) 329

[21] V.A. Kuzmin, V.A. Rubakov and M.E. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B 155 (1985) 36

[22] T. Hambye and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Lett. B 582 (2004) 73

[23] R. Barbieri et al., Nucl. Phys. B 575 (2000) 61

[24] S. Pascoli, S.T. Petcov and A. Riotto, hep-ph/0609125

[25] A. Abada et al., JHEP 0609 (2006) 010. The final formula is being checked out by the authors (A. Abada, private communication).

[26] D. Falcone and F. Tramontano, Phys. Rev. D 63 (2001) 073007

[27] E. Nezri and J. Orloff, JHEP 0304 (2003) 020

[28] S. Davidson and A. Ibarra, Phys. Lett. B 535 (2002) 25

[29] D. Falcone, Phys. Rev. D 66 (2002) 053001

[30] F. Buccella, D. Falcone and F. Tramontano, Phys. Lett. B 524 (2002) 241

[31] E.K. Akhmedov, M. Frigerio and A.Yu. Smirnov, JHEP 0309 (2003) 021

[32] P. Di Bari, Nucl. Phys. B 727 (2005) 318
E. Nardi et al., JHEP 0601 (2006) 164
O. Vives, Phys. Rev. D 73 (2006) 073006